

May 2, 1979

LB 489

PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes Senator Hefner.

SENATOR HEFNER: Mr. President and members of the body, I oppose the Brennan and Landis amendment. It's hard for me to describe better employment. Do we mean more money? Do we mean shorter hours? Do we mean cleaner work? Or maybe we ought to describe better employment. Also, in the last sentence it says, but shall be chargeable to the unemployment compensation insurance fund, but it would not be charged to the individuals account. Well just a few years ago we all had to kick in more money because the whole fund, the whole state fund, was depleted and so it raised our unemployment compensation contribution rate considerably. Therefore, I certainly urge you to oppose the amendment.

PRESIDENT: Senator Landis, you may close on your motion.

SENATOR LANDIS: Mr. Speaker and members of the Legislature, a couple of problems have been brought up. Number one, the definition of the term better employment. It's not as if this language is without precedent. I submit to you that the Iowa disqualification law has exactly the language that we are looking at here. In the Iowa law Title 96.5 it says, an individual shall be disqualified for benefits for voluntarily quitting if he has left his work voluntarily without good cause attributable to his employer, if so found by the Commissioner, but he shall not be disqualified if the Commission finds that he left his employment in good faith for the sole purpose of accepting better employment. There are lots and lots of cases to be used as precedents. Now, will Senator Hefner yield for a question?

PRESIDENT: Senator Hefner, will you respond?

SENATOR HEFNER: Yes.

SENATOR LANDIS: If the phrase better employment is used to describe either shorter hours or higher wages, is that sufficiently specific to explain what better employment is for your purposes?

SENATOR HEFNER: It would....I don't think we have a description in the Nebraska laws now, do we?

SENATOR LANDIS: No, and I'm saying if there was language to do that, would that be sufficiently specific for you, sir?